

Date: Sat, 19 Jun 93 00:30:09 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #199
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 19 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 199

Today's Topics:

 Blind VEs
 NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 19 Jun 93 00:33:11 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1vt5tk\$pug@chnews.intel.com> jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley,
W5GYJ) writes:

>

>Jim, W5GYJ writes:

>

>>>I wonder if a lot of this stuff about "proving" that blind hams can
>>>act as VE's comes from the amateur community having to "prove" that
>>>they could give exams with as much trustworthiness as an FCC 'droid,
>>>er, staffer, back when the VE program was proposed. And, seemingly,
>>>not being too convincing at it, since 1 FCC 'droid == 3 VE's.

>

>Bob McGwier, N4HY replies:

>

>>You have got to be kidding. Tell you what, you quadruple my salary as
>>a VE and if an FCC droid can live on that I will kiss your %^^.

>

>I really was talking about trustworthiness, not salary. My point was
>that the FCC agreed to replace its licensing examiner with three VE's
>under the assumption that it took that many to watch each other while
>the test was being given. Kind of like the KGB (or whatever it was
>called) under Stalin.

Keep in mind that FCC staffers would lose their job if they did it poorly. Volunteer examiners are not supposed to have any pecuniary interests of any kind in the licensing procedure, so several issues come up.

- #1. One FCC staffer may work harder at making sure nothing "wrong" happens in a test session than one VE, since the VE can cop the attitude "So what if someone cheats? Whaddaya gonna do, fire me?"
- #2. Since VEs don't get payed, the temptation towards corruption may be greater than for the FCC staffers.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 18 Jun 93 08:53:19 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!udel!news.intercon.com!psinntp!arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Oh yeah, I forgot the corollary to what I wrote.

Here in CT, the land of rolling hills, a 100 ft tower isn't the solution to a nearby hill 300 or 400 ft higher than you if you are trying to work VHF troposcatter in that direction. This happens to be a difficult problem for many CT VHF types. Thus, it isn't unheard of for a station with big towers, lots of power, and only an average to good location having trouble working stations worked easily by someone with a QRP rig on a hill.

I don't know if they changed the rules yet, but

back in Honolulu there was a 35 ft exemption
for antennas (no building permit needed), and a
95 ft limit after which a variance was required.

Having no written laws is one thing, but what
community has the *best* accommodations for
amateur antennas spelled out in writing?

Zack Lau KH6CP/1

Internet: zlau@arrl.org "Working" on 24 GHz SSB/CW gear
Operating Interests: 10 GHz CW/SSB/FM
US Mail: c/o ARRL Lab 80/40/20 CW
225 Main Street Station capability: QRP, 1.8 MHz to 10 GHz
Newington CT 06111 modes: CW/SSB/FM/packet
amtor/baudot
Phone (if you really have to): 203-666-1541

Date: 19 Jun 1993 00:15:21 -0500
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-
mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <25542@drutx.ATT.COM> n2ic@druwa.ATT.COM (LondonSM) writes:

[Twxt Deleted]

>
>NQ0I had every reason to believe that he would be able to put up a tall
>tower on 1.28 acres in 1986. Perhaps his only mistake was asking for
>a building permit, rather than just doing it !
>
>Steve, N2IC/0

Thanks for the comment, Steve. It seems to make sense to me, since amateurs
and rig manufacturers along with antenna and tower companies appear to share a
vested interest in limiting antenna restrictions.

I agree with a statement that was made in a previous article which was
essentially, "antenna = scapegoat." Unfortunately that's the attitude of the
general public towards amateur radio. As far as much of the public is
concerned our antennas are eyesores, and we're basically a load of weirdos who
are threatening the environment with electromagnetic radiation that (to them)
serves no useful purpose.

Popular opinion can be changed with the correct manipulation however (sorry if that sounds a bit callous, but that's the business), and such a PR effort combined with good old lobbying could go a long way.

As for my statement about NQOI checking for antenna restrictions, facts is facts and I stand corrected. And I think you're right. It *could* be that if NQOI had just put up his tower, this entire incident could have been avoided.

It's a shame when honest people can't try to do the right thing without being diddled by the government.

73 to All!

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will *NEVER* go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: 19 Jun 93 01:30:25 GMT
From: olivea!gossip.pyramid.com!pyramid!infmtx!moose!randall@ames.arpa
Subject: NQOI Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

n2ic@druwa.ATT.COM (LondonSM) writes:

>I think that Dave, N5RUL's proposal of a coalition between those interests
>who depend upon antennas is an excellent, well thought out idea. It's
>really ashamed that the ARRL has very little interest in organizing
>efforts in this area. If they can spend vast sums of money fighting the
>FCC over the loss of 220 MHz. why don't they see this as an important issue ?

Probably because they know it's a losing battle. Hams are NOT a powerful lobby, even when we team up with the satellite dish producers, Icom, Kenwood, etc. This proposal would mean overturning private legal contracts (deed restrictions) throughout the United States, restrictions that are strongly supported by millions of homeowners. We do live in a democracy; if an election were held on the issue, we as hams would lose and lose big. I am not saying this good, but I am saying that it is true.

--

=====

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Randall Rhea | Informix Software, Inc. |
| Project Manager, MIS Sales/Marketing Systems | uunet!pyramid!infmt!randall |

Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1993 05:50:37 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!
john@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

]john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

]>Well, I would point out that moon bounce requires enormous antennas. Are
]>we going to force all neighbors to tolerate 10 meter dishes?

]>

]>In other words, if you want to do serious VHF/UHF weak signal work,
]>get a mountain top well away from other people! If nothing else, having
]>neighbors means having EMI on your weak signal bands.

]>

]>We cannot reasonably expect to accomodate all modes of communication on all
]>bands with optimal antenna systems! It just isn't going to happen, and
]>it doesn't make sense for it too in all cases.

]So let me see if I have this straight. To pursue my hobby I have to find a
]new job, move my family, and what else? Also the number of 10 meter dishes
Yes.

]working the moon can probably be counted on 1 hand. Working the moon like
]working the satellites and local repeaters *is* one activity that *doesn't*
]absolutely require height and can be done with modest antennas based upon
]the number of people working the moon on single long yagis.

No, but tell a moonbouncer he MUST use a single long yagi when he
wants to use a 30' foot dish and I'll bet I'll hear the same arguments
that are being heard here in the NQ0I case!

]I don't think I've heard anyone proposing "optimal", just usable. Optimal
]antennas would be stacked long boom yagis at 100-200'. My request to put
]up a 10' roof mount tripod is hardly "optimal", yet it is prohibited by
]local zoning ordinances.

That seems a bit strict. Is it above 35 feet? If not, why not fight it?
Or are you talking about CC&R's?

]And I guess according to you, SSB operation on all the bands above 50 MHz
]is something out of the ordinary and not worthy of protection? That's

]great if you think amateur radio is limited to 2 meter FM repeaters and a
]few hundred kHz between 10 MHz and 30 MHz. Some of us think there is more
]to amateur radio than drive time and flaming on 20 meters.

Hey, gues what, dude.... I spend most of my ham time working on repeater
control systems, not ratchetjawing on 20. My point is that if you want
to do something exotic (and yes, weak signal work is relatively exotic)
and furthermore you want to do it as well as possible, then you are going
to have to be prepared to sacrifice.

]If people want to live in cookie cutter neighborhoods where everything
]looks like everything else, let them buy a house in an area with very
]restrictive covenants. But zoning laws impose their will upon a much
]larger area than a development. Zoning laws were started to prevent an
]industrial complex from being built next to a residential neighborhood, not
]to tell you what brand of mail box you have to install.

Yes, that's what they were started for. Unfortunately, the courts have
let them get far away from that (ie, into aesthetics). When you consider
that today, unlike 50 years ago, people's net worth is frequently tied
up in their houses, and that those people DO believe that antennas
reduce property values, then you can understand why they use the POLITICAL
process to protect those values. I would say that that is not
wrong of them, just an unfortunate clash of rights (theirs to have their
property values upheld, yours to use your property any way you want.)

Unfortunately, today we have too many people living on too little land,
and as a result they do indeed get into genuine conflicts of rights.
In such situations, and with us as a minority, we have to make our shots
count, and we have to recognize reality and realize that we won't win
every time and probably shouldn't win every time.

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu

- - A conservative is a liberal who has been mugged by reality! - -
- - Support ALL of the bill of rights, INCLUDING the 2nd amendment! - -

Date: 19 Jun 1993 00:28:58 -0500

From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-
mail@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun17.072435.2503@ke4zv.uucp>, <C8s46n.3rr@pacifier.rain.com>,
<1993Jun18.133103.9237@ke4zv.uucp>

Subject : Re: Blind VEs

In article <1993Jun18.133103.9237@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

I deleted the text of the above statement because I didn't have as much to write here. I agree with most of it however. It falls in line with the article that I posted to. The FCC *does* appear to have the "jaundiced eye" mentality that Gary mentioned.

>

>This issue goes beyond the physical impairments of some VE candidates.
>I don't think flight physicals are the answer, but certified observers
>certainly would be a step in the right direction.

Absolutely. If the FCC sees a problem in the VE system they should screen all prospective VEs. All the blind ask is that we be allowed to use our alternative skills in this process. If it works then great. If it doesn't, can us.

But I have to agree that this goes beyond physical ability. What the FCC seems to be concerned with is quality and integrity. I'm not sure what we can do about integrity, but a universal screening process would *certainly* help in the area of quality.

>

>Gary

73 to All!

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will *NEVER* go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: 19 Jun 93 01:04:21 GMT
From: olivea!gossip.pyramid.com!pyramid!infmx!moose!randall@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1vl0ge\$65v@doc.cc.utexas.edu>, <1993Jun16.110316.27557@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jun16.162531.23480@en.ecn.purdue.edu>
Subject : Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

Let me say first of all that I am a ham, and I am disappointed that NQ01 did not win his case. However, it is becoming apparent that

the days of the ham radio tower are over. Or, they are over in many areas. I am saying this because it is reality, not because I like it.

I just bought a house in a new subdivision that does not permit any external antennas of any kind. None - not even TV antennas. You may wonder why I as a ham did such a thing.

There are some subdivisions that do not have deed restrictions. We looked around for houses in them, but we found that some of the properties were very poorly maintained. They looked terrible, and this caused us not to buy in that area. Houses in such areas were on the market for much longer and sold at lower prices, hence our concern by buying there.

A house is a very large investment, probably the biggest one I will ever make. I do not expect to make money on my home, but I at least want to be able to sell it should the need arise. A decline in the value of the property, or an inability to sell it reasonably quickly, could present me with a serious financial problem. Most everyone else is in the same boat.

Anything that is perceived as causing a decline in property values is going to generate severe opposition from just about any homeowner for this reason. We as homeowners are scared, and given the decline of property values in many parts of the country, we have reason to be. Homeowners pay the property taxes and go to the polls, so the politicians and the courts listen to them, especially when they act in large numbers.

Antennas and power lines are perceived as lowering property values and causing a failure to sell a house in a reasonable period of time. Many people believe that radiation from power lines and antennas causes health problems including cancer. This may not be true, but the important thing is not the facts, it's what people think the facts are. We looked at a very nice house next to power lines, but it had been on the market for over a year and still has not sold. Antennas are also considered to be very ugly. (I don't think so, but many people do.)

Homeowners who see a potential decline in property values do not care about the public service amateur radio provides. They do not want to see antennas under any circumstances, and they will fight to keep them away. They will always outnumber the lone ham who wants to put up an antenna. Even when hams organize, they will never be a stronger

lobby than homeowners. I admire the hams who fight for their antennas in court, but I think they are fighting a losing battle.

I do not believe that we as hams can do anything about it. We could launch a massive PR campaign to show the benefits of ham radio and antennas, but it would be too expensive to reach enough people, and I don't think it would work anyway. We could continue to fight in court, but we seem to be losing, and I don't see anything getting better.

In buying my house, I basically surrendered to these painful but true facts. I have an AEA Isolooop and a dipole in the attic. They will never work as well as a beam on a tower, but I just have to live with it. I still have a lot of fun, but I will probably never win any contests. Lack of a tower does not mean the death of ham radio. I hope that vendors introduce more products like the Isolooop for hams with limited space.

--

```
=====
Randall Rhea                                Informix Software, Inc.
Project Manager, MIS Sales/Marketing Systems  uunet!pyramid!infmt!randall
```

Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1993 05:26:55 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!
john@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun18.163109.23263@ncar.ucar.edu>, <john.740424821@misty>,
<1993Jun18.222504.2424@ncar.ucar.edu>
Subject : Re: NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

elmore@rap.ucar.edu (Kim Elmore) writes:

]john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

] Perhaps your restrictions aren't the issue, though you seemed
]to indicate that because you have such remarkable restrictions, we
]should be happy with anything less restrictive than what you must deal
]with. I disagree.

No, my point is that we would be better off fighting the severe restrictions than wasting our limited political and legal resources on the RELATIVELY minor restrictions.

]still maintain setbacks. No CC&Rs. No pre-ordained height limits as]set by zoning, since amateur antennas were specifically and explicitly]exempted from them. Given this environment and understanding is it]surprising that, when limits appear somewhat capriciously ("We deem]antennas equivalent to building structures and so subject to structure]height limits") NQOI doesn't challenge them?

I agree, it is capricious, and I don't disagree with NQOI for challenging. I just don't think it's that big a deal TO THE REST OF US. I don't think it sets a harmful precedent (other than perhaps one that arbitrary changes in the laws can be made - something that hurts ALL citizens and isn't related to ham radio).

]>There is no question but what PRB-1 is poorly worded. However, the]>intent seems to be to require compromise - not to provide any absolute]>right to whatever antenna is needed for whatever mode is chosen. The court]>seems to have met that intent.

] Certainly that is the intent. Yet, we felt that the County]had done an end-run around due process and that the limits that now]exist were essentially made up as the process continued. While the]case dealt with antennas, it also dealt with *how* the limits were]created and implemented. NQOI felt that no "compromise" was ever]offered: a height limit was dictated by the County for which there was]no alteration mechanism. While I forget the wording exactly, he could]not seek a variance given the stated reasons for doing so. This left]him with no alternatives to the County-imposed 35 ft limit and so no]way to "compromise" that limit to something less restrictive. That,]after all, is the essence of compromise: both sides must move. The]County refused to offer anything but 35 ft. While, because of your]severe limits and offer of 35 ft seems a compromise (after all, it's]essentially twice what you have) an offer of 35 ft *here* constitutes]no compromise on the County's part.

Again, I agree that the due process run-around sucks. However, as far as I can tell the court didn't say that the county could do anything they want, it said they had to compromise.

Let me point out that this sounds like a case for POLITICAL, not legal action. Today in this country we seem to go running to the courts every time we get a result we don't like from the political process.

Yes, NQOI got screwed. No, I don't think that the 35 foot rule is absolutely wrong, and I am really pretty sure that it is legal

in light of PRB-1 and zoning case law. Furthermore, it is in fact a fairly reasonable antenna height for all but the most extreme communications requirements.

] NQOI was (and is) quite willing to accept significantly less
]than 125'; that just happens to be what the building permit was for.
]Since that was what was before the commission, he would have to apply
]again at another height to ask for less. Application for a variance
]costs \$625 in Boulder. There is no guarantee of what the outcome will
]be, so NQOI could apply at 70', but that might be \$625 down the tubes.
Did he argue THAT in his case?
]Then what? Remember here that the County wasn't offering anything
]different than 35'. In fact, counsel for the County stated that an
]"offer" of anything else would be improper, since the decision faced
]by the Commission was whether or not to approve specific building
]permits, not to negotiate them. Given this, NQOI decided, rightly I
]believe, to fight this case.
That's his choice.

]>I am not claiming that the COUNTY offered him a square deal. It does appear,
]>however, that the court has now offered him that.

] NQOI counsel does not agree. NQOI must apply for a building
]permit and, as none has been granted for a 60 foot anything (remember
]too that no commercially available 60' crank up meets the requirements
]considered, but never offered, by the planning board). Thus, since he
]has no building permit for a 60' antenna, and since that would violate
]the 35' height limit in Boulder County, he would be in violation of
]local zoning laws and subject to sanction.
So put up a 35 foot antenna!

] Yes, he does, but he isn't the rest of us and he did not walk
]into this "knowing" that a 35' height limit existed (since it didn't).
]If it were otherwise (CC&Rs or existing limitations on antennas) then
]he could be faulted, but such was not the case. Antennas were
]explicitly exempt from height limitations and all he was supposed to
]comply with were setbacks and wind survival. The rules changed as the
]game was played. It turns out that this is (now) legal.

And I didn't move into Phoenix knowing that I had no choice but to accept tough CC&R's. Life's a bitch, ain't it. I would point out that if it wasn't possible to change the rules, zoning would be impossible in all but communities with no inhabitants or property owners! Thus zoning law must be allowed to change ex post facto or we cannot have it at all. Now, from a personal point, I am skeptical about zoning in general, but the courts are not. Hence the change of rules business is legal, even if obnoxious.

]>All I know is that I have a fair amount of experience with selling
]>real estate and buying it, and I KNOW beyond a shadow of a doubt that
]>having large antennae nearby increase the difficulty (and hence the
]>expense) of selling houses - especially in scenic areas (such as where
]>I live). Of course, this won't show up in your studies because the
]>antennas aren't allowed. Thus your study is invalid for this case, as
]>it self selects those neighborhoods with weak CC&R's.

] Precisely the same argumets were attempted in upholding
]covenants against balcks in certain neighborhoods. They didn't
]withsatnd scrutiny, either. The study is quite valid and results of
]similar studies have been upheld by the Supreme Court. CC&Rs were not
]and are not in question here. the neighborhood had no CC&Rs against
]antennas, The study was appripriate and valid. You're confusing CC&Rs
]with zoning here and it is inappropriate as applied to this case.

You (or some previous poster) was arguing with me that MY antennas would
reduce property value if they were high. I was pointing out the error
of this. I can't judge that in BC because I'm not there.

]>Well, you can rant and rave all you want, but it is not going to affect
]>the outcome. Do you think that I like these compromises just because I
]>am arguing against an absolutist property-rights positions? Do you really
]>think I believe that NIMBYism is always right? Remember, you are arguing
]>with the person who successfully LED the opposition to the Phoenix antenna
]>ordinance!

] I am neither ranting nor raving. I'm glad you succeeded in
]Phoenix. Your implication is that we did something obviously "wrong"
]in this case. Such implication is incorrect. Every attempt was made
]to discuss alternatives and compromises with all officials. Nice was
]tried. NQOI was unwilling to roll over and so decided to take a
]stand.

No, I don't think you did something obviously wrong. My whole point is that
the NQOI case shouldn't be considered important for amateur radio in
general, given the conditions in the country. I am not arguing that it
is unimportant to NQOI.

] NQOI does not live in a SPD, SPDs were never mentioned and
]play no part in this case. Consideration of this case as it might
]apply to an SPD is simply irrelevant. Where did this come from?

You just weren't reading what I wrote. Not every paragraph in this discussion
has applied strictly and solely to NQOI.

]>I'll be that if you started flying model airplanes around the neighborhood,

]>people would bitch about the noise.

] Perhaps, though any Academy of Model Aeronautics (AMA)
]santioned activity requires mufflers. Even so, electric models are
]quite popular and they are essentially silent in operation. Model
]aircraft were intended to be an example; I'll not argue their
]applicability to the case here.

Simply my point that nuisance is recognized (rightfully IMHO) in
property rights issues.

]>Look, all of us want to be able to pursue our avocations on our property.
]>It's ourse, right? But, at the same time, most of us don't want our
]>neighbors to put rusting cars on blocks all over their front yard, even
]>if their avocation is car restoring. This indicates to me the need for
]>compromise (which isn't the same as the consensus you mention above).

]>No, you EXPECT it. I highly value freedom, but I also recognize the reasoning
]>of those I disagree with, including those who don't value it at all. I am
]>simply trying to say it like it is, and show the underlying logic. The
]>courts have held, starting in the 50's, that zoning may be done for
]>aesthetic reasons. I believe they are wrong (ie, CC&R's should be
]>used for that purpose) but my belief doesn't change what the courts
]>have upheld. I have read the decisions and understand the reasoning, even
]>if I don't like the result.

] In fact, I do expect certain freedoms associated with paying
]the mortgage. When I am denied what I feel is reasonable and just,
]then I will demand it. What we disagree on is what freedoms are
]reasonable and just. Either you expect fewer freedoms than I do, or
]you demand fewer. The result is the same regardless of the semantics
]applied. While aesthetics are a valid concern for zoning, it has been
]historically difficult to base zoning strictly on them. You and I
]disagree as to "how it is".

Well, when you demand and expect things that you aren't gonna get,
you look sort of silly. Historically (since 1960) the courts have
upheld zoning based solely on aesthetics. I was shocked when I first
read those decisions, but that's the way IT IS. Now, you and I and the
courts know that aesthetics is subjective, but hey, they still are
using it.

In the US today, we have people who

- claim the right to do anything they damn well feel like with themselves
or their property
- want to be protected from negative results from others who feel they
can do any damn thing they want.

The courts and the political process are to resolve this. When we make absolutist claims (I MUST have the optimal antenna) for example, we are not likely to win. The mitigating factors you mentioned (nearby power lines, for example) simply mean that we don't lose as badly as we could.

] It's his (or her) yard. As long and noxious weeds are
]controlled, no vermin inhabit the cars and they do not pose a danger
]to the safety of children in the neighborhood I have no problem with
]legitimate restoration efforts. However, storage of garbage and trash
]is improper in anyplace but a facility for that. If my neighbor were
]essentially storing wrecks, I would indeed ask that they be put
]elsewhere.

Okay, then you are well out of the mainline. It is well known (and yes, there are studies that show this) that having cars stored on blocks in a neighborhood is associated with declining property values.

]>How about if you live in a
]>neighborhood where home values range up to \$5,000,000 (like I do)?
]>Note that the cars do NOT constitute a hazard, they are only an aesthetic
]>nuisance.

] Simply because someone's home is valued at \$5M, does that make
]it any different from mine valued at \$75k? What does price have to do
]with it? A concept such as this is either generally applicable or it
]isn't. Do the rich deserve favor that the rest of us do not?

Hate to say it, but the price DOES make a difference. The people who buy luxury homes are more demanding, because they DO have a choice. That means that minor flaws can significantly reduce the value of an expensive home in an expensive neighborhood, where those same things would have no impact in a less expensive neighborhood. Once again, you apparently are denying reality because of some abstract principle.

Because of this reality, by the way, I was able to buy a slight fixer-upper that normally would have been well out of my price range, but which wouldn't sell because people in the luxury house market wouldn't touch it (while it is common for people to buy houses that are not perfect in lower price ranges). Reality doesn't argue, it just is.

]>I think discussing this analogous situation should shed light on the
]>antenna issue.

] Perhaps, though NOOI did not propose erecting and then
]abandoning a tower or antenna installation. As long as the cars were
]being worked on and actively attended to, then I have no problem with
]such restorative efforts. If they are abandoned and left to rust,

]then it is inappropriate.

Again, you are in the minority. In Phoenix, even though ham antennas are legal, cars on blocks are not.

]>Gee, that would really be a win. However, I don't see why it was considered
]>a PRB-1 loss - please explain.

] The "compromise" implied by the County and that the Court
]indicated was acceptable, is to move elsewhere. That, in my view, is
]no compromise.

No, the compromise implied by the court is to go up to 60 feet. The
compromise actually given by the country is to put up antennae at
35 feet. Both provide quite adequate communication.

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu
- - If a field of study has the word "science" in it - it isn't a science - -
- - Support ALL of the bill of rights, INCLUDING the 2nd amendment! - -

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #199
